

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/775,677	Applicant(s) SOLEM ET AL.	
	Examiner Urmi Chattopadhyay	Art Unit 3738	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Urmi Chattopadhyay. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mark Garscia. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 April 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: Not applicable.

Claim(s) discussed: 22, 38, 40 and 89.

Identification of prior art discussed: Imran (USPN 5,817,126); Orth et al. (USPN 5,591,197).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed claim 89 as reading on the elected species shown in Figures 19 and 20, and therefore claim 89 will no longer be withdrawn from consideration. Discussed a proposed amendment to the claims that would require the elongate body to be adapted to close a gap in the mitral valve and if the forces acting on the coronary sinus by the cited prior art stents would be capable of performing this function. Prior art stents that are expanded beyond the diameter of the vessel in which it is implanted and ratcheting stents that maintain their expanded diameters were mentioned by the examiner. Discussed another proposed amendment to the claims that limits the proximal and distal ends of the elongate body as having a greater cross-sectional profile than a central section of the elongate body in at least one of the first and second configurations as overcoming the outstanding 103(a) rejection.